

REMARKS

This amendment is offered in response to the Office Action of June 29, 2009.

The claims have been amended to obviate numbered paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

The Office Action rejected Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Fraser reference (U.S. 1,960,580) as well as the DeBolt reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,319,430) (two separate rejections).

Claims 12 and 13 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby obviating these rejections.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 4-11, 14, 15 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Leighton reference (Great Britain Patent No. 2,349,603) in view of the Buchman reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,588,176). Similarly, the Office Action rejected Claims 2, 3 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Leighton reference in view of the Buchman reference and further in view of Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art.

As stated in the Office Action, the Leighton reference does not teach that pre-cut lengths zipper having a slider mounted thereon during the manufacturing process. It appears that the Buchman reference was cited merely for the purpose of suggesting that a zipper in transit could include a slider. It appears that such a combination not only is the result of the wisdom of hindsight gained after review of the disclosure, but also that such a combination would not suggest the inline application of a slider to zipper before the zipper is driven into the turret (i.e. "means for feeding pre-cut lengths of zipper comprising first and second interengageable profiles and a slider mounted thereon successively to the grooves of the turret at a loading location different from the attachment location" as recited in Claim 1), would not suggest the turret

having (plural) grooves into which the zipper is driven (see previous claim quotation). Moreover, Claim 1 was previously amended to recite “wherein grooves in the turret include a wider portion for receiving the slider on each pre-cut zipper length” (with a similar amendment to Claim 14). Such a structure in the grooves in the turret are to accommodate the slider along with the zipper, and nothing in the cited references would teach or suggest such a structure.

It is further respectfully submitted that nothing in Applicant’s alleged admission of prior art would resolve this deficiency in the cited prior art.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that these rejections are overcome.

For all of the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of the claims, to enter this amendment, to allow the claims, and to pass this application to early issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Brown
Registration No. 32,200

DAY PITNEY LLP
7 Times Square
New York, New York 10036-7311
(212) 297-5800